Mantik p 220

"Controversy" - some said LHO not guilty, some other domestic conspiracy

220 Argues that disproving medical evidence begins with them, is new ignorance of all before them

Past works do this better because they do not depend on interpretations or observations than can have other meanings than Mantik gives them. My book, for example, is based entirely on the official evidence, with no experiments or tests

221 Hung up on own concepts, his experiments & his ideas, or that the false autopsy is all the medical evidence. But he and his associates are ignorant of the existing work that is not confused or confusing

"They would not have known who fired the fatal shot" without Dealey Plaza. The also would not - ended, not with ... Dealey Plaza. Still again without end, subject-matter ignorance. Besides, Mantik does not know the real "Dealey Plaza evidence

Mantik -2

If WC had "reviewed" all the photos that could not have told them who fired the fatal shot, again subject-matter ignorance or their origin.

Mantik says he begins largely confined to the medical evidence. It would be more accurate if he had said his concept of a very small part of the medical evidence in which he adds nothing to what was known of that part and he adds no knowledge to what was known about the crime, to other parts of the medical evidence or to what was known about it. He reveals regularly his belief that it all starts with him when no part does. He then says what is false, that the medical evidence "can yield no meaningful conclusion about Oswald's ultimate guilt or innocence." It can and it did and he is ignorant of it while talking down to all others including those who did the work he is ignorant of

238 Mantik on Z film pt 5. Does Mantik know enough of the basic fact to have a dependable opinion

245 Recollection after decades prove picture doctored sort of conclusion

Mantik -3

But, I recall no stated conclusions. It is
obvious that, in addition to believing all film is "doctored"
and hence useless, they argue against pathologists' and
Commission conclusions. But none of them question what
observers say is their recollection – of such an unusual
& shocking event – and after so much time has passed
no real questioning of eyewitness statements
256 throat wound. They all knew that Humes had
spoken to Perry about 10:30 from the autopsy room
that Perry earlier referred to it as a [illegible] wound was
on radio and TV beginning a little he said it
The proof that Humes had phoned Perry on Saturday is in
the first book on the subject, 1965's Whitewash
no sinister purpose attributed to it which F makes so
much about. But in saying that Perry does not care anymore F
does not report that it is after 35 years of endless badger by those
who generally import innate ignoramus on ego trips
An example of how these people are all wrapped up in
260 what as Johnny Come Latelies interest them only
and lead them to display their subject-matter ignorance to
the concept that the hole in JFK's chest could have been
been from a "grog" fragment when there was none that big
from the windshield and it could not have left the
metal fragments in the chest, all info available to
them years before assassination bug bit them but it
does not help with their dream of fame so for them it
does not exist. They know about it, too – use other info.
from that book, Post Mortem, credited, partly credited
and not credited. Their problem is that for all their work
they add no new fact about the assassination and nothing
really new about its investigation about which
from their writing they are ignorant. They have not
yet caught up with what was known before they started
on essentially unnecessary work that added nothing essential –
if it is accurate & means what they say it does
272 Mantik & Horne do not know of Humes's practical destruct-
ion although Humes testified to it and it is in the part of PM they use!
Ignorant of official fact even though they draw what they think
they can use from a publish account of that official fact, so they
conjecture always
283 When Mantik first saw NAA results that is when the
lone assassin theory began to disintegrate for him

guess he never read the first (1965) book, or he did not under-stand it.

In this and following parts Mantik flaunts his subject matter ignorance and that for him all that exists is what his sick ego tells him is important and is not in any sense – when it is not also pathetic and stupid as well as not correct – or true. Exp 283 For them what is not their notion has no existence. Nothing was established before them.

The Zap Film Controversy 325ff

Ronn/Eyewitnesses: her claimed authority does not say that eyewitnesses are always more dependable & accurate than photos & that is the way Mantik uses what he says she says. It has a subhead "Eyewitnesses in the (339) Professional Literature" but not one on "Eyewitnesses in The Court Room

343 "head snap" not at time of head wound from the front. When was that shot, then?